

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
DANVILLE DIVISION

DONALD TRANTHAM, JR.,)	
)	4:10CV00058
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
HENRY COUNTY SHERIFF'S)	
OFFICE, ET AL.,)	By: Jackson L. Kiser
)	Senior United States District Judge
Defendants)	

Before me are Motions to Dismiss and supporting briefs from every named Defendant. Gardner, Barrow, Sharpe & Reynolds Mot. to Dismiss, Dec. 8, 2010, ECF No. 4; Gardner, Barrow, Sharpe & Reynolds Br. in Supp., Dec. 8, 2010, ECF No. 6; Martinsville Police Mot. to Dismiss, Dec. 15, 2010, ECF No. 8; Martinsville Police Br. in Supp., Dec. 15, 2010, ECF No. 9; Commonwealth's Attorney Mot. to Dismiss, Dec. 23, 2010, ECF No. 12; Sheriff's Office Mot. to Dismiss, Dec. 23, 2010, ECF No. 13; Br. in Supp. for Commonwealth's Attorney and Sheriff's Office, Dec. 23, 2010, ECF No. 14; Hospital Mot. to Dismiss, Dec. 23, 2010, ECF No. 15; Hospital Br. in Supp., Dec. 23, 2010, ECF No. 16; State Police Mot. to Dismiss, Dec. 29, 2010, ECF No.27; State Police Br. in Supp., Dec. 29, 2010, ECF No. 28; DEA Mot. to Dismiss, Feb. 3, 2011, ECF No. 33; DEA Br. in Supp., Feb. 3, 2011, ECF No. 34. In addition, Defendant Gardner, Barrow, Sharpe & Reynolds, P.C. has moved for a hearing on its Motion to Dismiss. Mot. for a Hearing, Dec. 8, 2010, ECF No.5. The pro se Plaintiff was sent three Roseboro notices, the last of which the Clerk's Office mailed on February 3rd, 2011, setting the response deadline for February 24th, 2011. Third Roseboro Notice, Feb. 3, 2011, ECF No. 35. To date, the Plaintiff has not responded to any of the Motions to Dismiss. For the reasons discussed in the Memorandum Opinion accompanying this Order, the Plaintiff's claims against all the named

Defendants are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** and Defendant Gardner, Barrow, Sharpe & Reynolds, P.C.'s Motion for a Hearing is **DENIED**.

ENTERED this 10th day of March, 2011.

s/Jackson L. Kiser

SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE